



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ters or similar sounds. The Hebrew method doubtless seems to us more artificial than the English. But this is because we are less familiar with it. We do not deem it puerile for the modern poet to end his lines artificially: was it puerile for the ancient poet to begin his lines artificially?

Nor is this all. It must be remembered that in ancient times there were no printing-presses to record and preserve the poet's effusions. If they were preserved at all, they were chiefly preserved in the amber of memory. How much memory is aided by these artifices of structure and arrangement is apparent from the fact that most persons remember poetry, especially rhymes, more easily than they remember prose.

Another circumstance ought to be added. Some of the Psalms were composed while the Israelites were in captivity. Exiles from the land of their fathers, they were greatly aided in their devotions and in the memory of their ancestral songs by these artificial devices of parallelisms, alliterations, and alphabetic order.

These considerations, and others which might be added, are sufficient to repel the charge of puerility which has sometimes been brought against the Hebrew poetry.

THE INTERPRETATION OF AMOS V., 25, 26.

BY PROFESSOR F. B. DENIO,

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

It is said by Wellhausen and one, at least, of his followers that the literary prophets teach that a sacrificial system was no part of Mosaism. [Wellhausen, *History of Israel*, pp. 56 seq.; Robertson Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 287 seq.] The following passages are pressed into service to prove the statement: Isa. i., 11-15; Hos. iv., 6-11; viii., 11-13; Mic. vi., 6-9; Amos ii., 4; v., 21-27; Jer. vii., 21-23. The two last passages are the really important ones. The remaining passages will readily fall into the line indicated by these two.

Amos v., 21-27. The historical setting of Amos' prophecy is this: Amos was sent to the northern kingdom where the worship rendered to Yahwe was schismatic and mingled with idolatrous practices. Verses 21-24 are a declaration of the unacceptable nature of this worship. "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." The last verse announces the fact that a punishment for their disobedience is to sweep over the land. Verse 27 announces the same fact. "Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith the Lord, whose name is the God of hosts." The verses to be examined are the 25th and the 26th.

Several grammatical points are to be noted: (1) At the beginning of the 25th verse is the syllable *haz*. It may be the article or the sign of a question. (a) The following reasons are quite strong against regarding it as the article: The word "offerings" has no article. The two words "sacrifices and offerings" are used

together—as here—many times, and the article is regularly omitted with both. The Septuagint and Vulgate take this as a question. (b) Taking this as a question, what does it signify? The question so introduced commonly signifies uncertainty, doubt or denial [Ewald Heb. Gram. 324. b.; Nord. 1099; Ges. 153. 2; Müller's Heb. Syntax 143], and sometimes it signifies affirmation, as Num. xx., 10; 1 Sam. ii., 27; Job xx., 4; Jer xxxi., 20.

(2) The emphatic words in the verse are “sacrifices and offerings.” This precludes the interpretation “did ye bring...to me” as contrasted with bringing to some one else. It means “did ye bring *sacrifices and offerings*” to the neglect of other service.

(3) Verse 26 begins with “and ye bore.” The form *unesa'them* might be regarded as perfect with Waw consecutive. This would be almost inevitable in the Pentateuch. Amos is not uniform in this respect. Amos iv., 7 *wehimtarti* “and I caused it to rain;” vii., 2 *wehaya* “and it came to pass;” vii., 4 *we'akhela* “and would have eaten” are illustrations of the lawlessness of Amos' style. Linguistically there is [cf. Driver 119. a, foot-note] somewhat more reason to regard this case in v., 26 as a Waw consecutive, but exegetical reasons must settle the case. To the writer the Waw seems to be an adjunctive Waw to be translated by *also*.

Turning to the context, we notice that verses 21–23 state the offense of the house of Israel, verse 24 threatens punishment, verse 27 again threatens punishment. Verse 25 brings in the idea of offering sacrifices to God in the wilderness-wandering; this must be for the purpose of illustration. If the prophet means to say that Israel offered no sacrifices to God in that wilderness-wandering, the verse does not illustrate, nor serve his argument at all. If, however, we translate as follows, we have a perfect accord with the context: “Did ye bring to me in the wilderness forty years *sacrifices and offerings*, O house of Israel? Ye also bore Siccuth your king, and Chiun your images, the star of your god which ye made for yourselves.” [For their unfaithfulness I punished them, ye are likewise unfaithful] verse 27, “therefore will I cause you to go into captivity,” etc.

This passage, so far from implying the variance of a sacrificial system with Mosaism, implies the reverse. The present purpose is fully served by showing the adequacy of this interpretation to all linguistic and contextual requirements. Space does not permit the examination of other interpretations. It is unfortunate that we have no historical indications of the period when Israel worshiped these idols. It is certain, however, that the interpretation proposed is in full accord with the general teaching of Scripture, and not at variance with the pentateuchal record.

The other important passage is Jer. vii., 21–23. “Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Add your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat ye flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you.” Here the burnt-offering which (Lev. i., 9) was to be wholly burned and so devoted wholly to God was so unacceptable that it might be eaten as well as the other offerings which the worshiper was accustomed to eat. This disregard of the ritual which they considered required by God would be a light matter beside the disregard of the spiritual

requirements of God. This is the teaching of verse 21. The two following verses are intended to confirm this teaching. Verse 22 is in form a categorical statement that no ritual had been enjoined when Israel came forth from Egypt. Must it mean this? But for verse 23 it must; this, however, may materially modify the apparent significance of verse 22. Language affords many instances where a contrast is in form logical and absolute, but in reality it is rhetorical and relative, e. g., in the New Testament, John XII., 44, "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me but on him that sent me." Similar instances are in Matt. x., 20; Mark ix., 37; Luke x., 20; Acts v., 4; 1 Cor. xv., 10; 2 Cor. ii., 5; Gal. ii., 20. Of course, for the passage in question Old Testament usage would be more valuable. Such a contrast by means of *lo' . . . khi 'im*, "not . . . but" is not frequent in the Old Testament. All instances that the writer has found are in the book of Jeremiah. They go to show that this mode of expression was somewhat common with him. Jer. ix., 23, 24, "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth, and knoweth me," etc. Jer. xx., 3, "Then said Jeremiah unto him, The Lord hath not called thy name Pashur, but Magor-missabib." xxiii., 7, 8, "Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, As the Lord liveth which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, As the Lord liveth, which brought up and led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country and from all the countries whither I had driven them."

The following passages contain further evidence of the tendency of the Hebrew mind, not to say the human mind, to express a relative truth in absolute terms: Gen. xxix., 31, 33; Deut. xxi., 15, 16, 17; Mal. i., 2, 3; Matt. vi., 24; Luke xiv., 26; xvi., 13; John xii., 25.

As a result of this examination we see that the passage may not be used in proof of Wellhausen's position without other and decisive evidence. So far as the writer has observed, these two passages Amos v., 25; Jer. vii., 22, are the chief witnesses—not to say the only witnesses—seeming to speak positively. Yet these cannot by a legitimate exegesis be described as speaking so positively. This passage in Jeremiah may be turned the other way, as well as that in Amos. Where the absolute contrast is used to express a relative contrast, the less important has a subordinate existence. The contrast between the principal and the subordinate, the essential and the non-essential elements, is intended to be put in the strongest manner possible. To the occidental mind this seems an exaggerated mode of expressing truth and one liable to lead to error. Yet there is no doubt that it is used by even an occidental when there is no reason to fear misapprehension.

Are there any indications of Jeremiah's judgment respecting the sacrificial system? Wellhausen, *Hist. of Israel*. p. 59, says, Jeremiah "is far from hating the cultus (xvii., 26)." This statement of Wellhausen's implies the necessity of an explanation, which is not given, of the fact that Jeremiah should place any value upon the sacrificial system if it were not of divine appointment. Whatever else is proved in the volumes quoted in this article, it seems certain that the argument based on these passages has no basis; for the passages support an entirely different teaching. 1 Cor. i., 17 would be an equally valid argument to prove that Christ did not authorize the sacrament of baptism.